DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 303 912 EA 020 742

AUTHOR Blake, Norine; DeMont, Roger A.
TITLE Implementing Clinical Supervision: A District Approach.
PUB DATE Mar 89
NOTE 31p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Association of School Administrators (Orlando, FL, March 1989).
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Tests/Evaluation Instruments (160) -- Reports - Descriptive (141)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Educational Development; Educational Planning; Elementary Secondary Education; *School Districts; Supervisory Methods; *Systems Development; *Teacher Evaluation; *Teacher Supervision; Training; *Training Methods
IDENTIFIERS *Avondale School District MI; *Clinical Supervision

ABSTRACT

This paper describes the Avondale School District's approach to incorporating clinical supervision within the teacher evaluation process. The development of major teacher appraisal systems, their underlying philosophies, and their characteristics are reviewed. In addition, specific processes and training activities used to develop a district model are identified. Finally, the procedures, conditions, and evaluation forms adopted for use are included. (JAM)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED303912

AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF SCHOOL ADMINISTRATORS

IMPLEMENTING CLINICAL SUPERVISION: A DISTRICT APPROACH

AASA CONVENTION
ORLANDO, FLORIDA
MARCH 3, 1989

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☒ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Norine Blake

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Norine Blake
Assistant Superintendent
Avondale School District
260 South Squirrel
Auburn Hills, Michigan 48057
(313) 852-4411

Roger A. DeMont
Professor, Administrative & Organizational Studies
Wayne State University
Detroit, Michigan 48202
(313) 577-1652

EA 020 742

IMPLEMENTING CLINICAL SUPERVISION: A DISTRICT APPROACH

DESCRIPTION

This paper will describe the Avondale School District's approach to incorporating clinical supervision within the teacher evaluation process. The development of major teacher appraisal systems, their underlying philosophies, and their characteristics will be reviewed. Conditions in the Avondale School District which precipitated clinical supervision will be explained. In addition, specific processes and training activities used to develop a district model will be identified. Finally, the procedures, conditions, and evaluation forms agreed upon and adopted for use will be reported.

OBJECTIVES

1. To describe a district's clinical supervision model.
2. To provide practical suggestions for implementation.
3. To identify the relationship between supervision and improved instruction.

IMPLEMENTING CLINICAL SUPERVISION: A DISTRICT APPROACH

Norine Blake
Avondale School District

and

Roger A. DeMont
Wayne State University

EVALUATION PRACTICES

The practice of evaluating teachers has existed in the United States throughout our country's history. However, the methods employed, the personnel involved, and the instruments used have varied. As the organizational framework and structure of the formal school system evolved, accompanying changes in both the purpose and in the format of teacher evaluation also occurred.

Early attempts at evaluation focused on the teacher's role as a "keeper." Such responsibilities included the maintenance of the building, the procurement and distribution of materials, and the discipline of students. If all the necessary prerequisites to learning were present in the physical environment, then the teacher was often deemed successful. Teaching ability in and of itself was not usually examined. This was due mainly to the fact that the supervisors were often lay people. The prevailing opinion of the times was that order was the most essential component of a good educational system.[1]

After the turn of the century the focus and purpose of teacher evaluation shifted in direct response to the development of more complex school systems. The highly stratified, multi-building organizations that emerged called for a different management orientation than did the one room schoolhouse. During this period many scholars adopted approaches which would help modernize administrative practices. Scientific management theories such as those of Frederick Winslow Taylor played an important part in school supervision. Thus, the emphasis on performance, specialization, and efficiency resulted in the need for a site supervisor - the principal - and the beginning of a new form of evaluation for teachers. With this model the criteria used to determine a teacher's competence incorporated Taylor's principles of scientific management - the efficient use of time, motion, and energy. The checklist as the evaluation

instrument prevailed. However, it was expanded to include a new emphasis on student achievement, often documented by test scores or grades.

Another stage in what might be called the preclinical supervision era again approximated the theories of leading management experts. Leadership during the 1940s and 1950s was viewed as the ability to release human potential. The talk of the times was on democratic processes and positive feedback with an emphasis on group interaction. The principal's role changed as well. As an evaluator one was expected to provide resources and guidance in helping to mutually solve any problems which may occur in the classroom. Needless to say, this new role of the principal proved to be unfamiliar and difficult for many. Instructional expertise had started to erode and management expertise had taken over. "Boss" roles were more familiar and comfortable than "helper" roles and the evaluation practices of the time seemed to reflect that difference.

As would be expected, there was extensive community reaction to the confused state of public education during this period. Therefore, administrative practices returned to a more regimented style in which defined processes, such as management and teaching by objectives, dominated. Many of the evaluation systems reflected these outcome approaches. It has been argued that the objectives approach proved beneficial to modern management in that it has improved supervisory practices by making the individual administrator more responsible than in the past.

However, the objectives approach to teacher evaluation proved to be another fragmented system that did little to improve the learning of youngsters, the skills of the teacher, or the image of the profession. These evaluations, similar to those that preceded them, did not take into account many of the key variables that affect the learning environment. Unfortunately, not only has evaluation historically been viewed as a negative experience, far too often the process itself failed to achieve its intended purpose.

CLINICAL SUPERVISION

Clinical supervision, on the other hand, offers a conceptual framework for addressing many of the essential environmental components central to the teaching-learning process. The purpose of clinical supervision is to improve and enhance the instructional skills of the teacher. It promises to provide a more comprehensive approach to teacher evaluation than any of the models currently employed.

Two names that appear prominently in the early literature of clinical supervision are Morris Cogan and Robert Goldhammer.[2] During the 1950s, Cogan, a professor of education at Harvard University, collaborated with his colleagues to devise, refine, and practice supervisory techniques that included elements of the established models of teacher evaluation as well as some new ones. The scientific approach of Taylor that called for each act to be task analyzed in order to identify its sequential component parts was retained as were the human relations ingredients of cooperative effort, conferencing, and mutually determined goals. The MBO practice of stating an objective and listing the strategies for accomplishment was also employed. Cogan, however, added a new dimension in order to make the model more comprehensive. This added dimension called for the clinical observation of the teaching-learning process.

In his research, Goldhammer, an early developer and advocate of Cogan's theory of clinical supervision, stressed the significance of classroom observation. He identified observation as the most critical and valuable method of gathering data which could yield accurate and reliable information regarding the effectiveness of a teacher's instruction. Elliot Eisner and Madeline Hunter both support this contention stating that it is impossible to make fair judgments about the teaching-learning process without first observing the players in action.

Clinical supervision is a cyclical model which emphasizes the analysis of observable actions and practices of a teacher while instructing. It includes (1) a preconference in which the objectives of the lesson are discussed, (2) the observation of the lesson by the supervisor who details (scripts) what took place, (3) an analysis of the observation using common language and predetermined codes, and (4) a post-observation conference in which feedback is given according to observed behaviors, not judgments. The feedback is then followed by appropriate coaching in which both parties analyze alternative strategies to reach objectives. Together the teacher and supervisor plan appropriate assistance and follow up activities.[3]

The goal of clinical supervision is the improvement of instruction as measured by student achievement; the means are systematic feedback and coaching based upon observation and analysis.

This process can and has been used as the basis for a teacher evaluation system.

THE AVONDALE EXPERIENCE

While the implementation of an improved system of teacher evaluation based upon a clinical model of supervision is in and of itself a major undertaking, in the Avondale School District the original incentive for changing the teacher evaluation system was the result of a much more comprehensive goal. In 1984, after years of financial struggles and administrative preoccupation with stretching precious and limited dollars to ensure solvency, the financial condition of the school district began to improve. The industrial tax base supporting the school district of 3000 students, located 20 miles north of Detroit, expanded. Additional revenues were channeled into the system and the days of severe program cuts, salary freezes, reduced schedules, and personnel layoffs came to an end.

During those bleak years of financial distress, the collective energy of the school community was focused on keeping the district afloat. At that time the United Avondale Movement, a committee comprised of parents and most school personnel, engaged in such tasks as collecting empty soft drink bottles and cans and donating the refund money to the school coffers. The sheer determination of school board members, teachers, and administrators coupled with the home town pride of area residents prevented the school system from dissolving. On the positive side, such conditions fostered cooperation, unity, loyalty, and organizational pride. Unfortunately, these same financial conditions, which resulted from the district's exhaustive struggle for survival, blunted the school community's expectations for academic scholarship.

However, with the increased income the Avondale community renewed its efforts toward establishing an enhanced curriculum, heightened its interest in overall student performance, and expressed a need for increased system accountability. The new resources led to a new school environment. In turn, the new environment called for new thinking.

As people celebrated the newly acquired good fortune of the school district, and commended each other for the self-reliance and perseverance each had demonstrated during the hard times, subtle yet significant and somewhat unsettling questions were posed of Avondale school leaders. What district goals would now replace the previously all consuming singular task of fiscal survival? What would be the main mission of the school district? Towards which preferred outcomes would the energy and expertise of district personnel be directed? What would be required of teachers and administrators under these changed conditions? A more challenging environment began to take shape.

THE NEW DIRECTION

During the 1984-1985 school year, the one certainty that emerged amid the myriad of unknowns and possibilities was the inevitability of change. The former mode of operation no longer fit the new profile of the district. The financial constraints which once plagued the district and depleted the energy of the school professionals were gone. Most people expected that a more comprehensive set of instructional goals would drive the organization since resources would be available to maintain and support such efforts. The primary goal would no longer be financial. Instead the district was to have a curriculum and instruction focus. Its mission would be to improve the learning outcomes of students. All dimensions of the structure of the school district would be examined, evaluated, and revised to maximize their ability to facilitate and support the instructional goal of increased student learning.

The umbrella goal of improved student performance served as the keystone in a framework of related objectives. Plans for enriching curriculum offerings, staff development opportunities, instructional methodologies, organizational structures, long-range planning processes, budgeting techniques, personnel practices, marketing strategies, and management procedures were developed, finalized, and implemented simultaneously across the district. Each departmental area targeted for growth and development during the five year period has achieved significant success.

As one might expect, the rate and degree of success varied according to a variety of factors. These variables included the type of activity being implemented, the personnel involved, and most importantly, the amount of change implicit in the new design. Nevertheless, annual reports for the past few years document the impressive progress made in all categories of operation.

Of the numerous and diverse activities mentioned, restructuring the teacher evaluation process proved to be the most challenging goal of all. It required an enhanced sensitivity for individuals' personal experiences, a tolerance for great diversity of thinking, and a generous allotment of time. Evaluation of any sort is threatening. Replacing a familiar format with an unknown was bound to raise teachers' level of concern, especially when the request for the change came from the administration, as was the case in Avondale.

Because the principles of trust, colleagiality, and shared responsibility are essential to the practice of clinical supervision, the entire planning process could have been seriously jeopardized if the group discussions or the staff development activities had in any way been rushed or bypassed. Instead, the Avondale administrators chose to proceed slowly and openly with the involvement of influential teachers representing all levels and interests in the school system. While Avondale does not lay claim to a perfect plan, the fact that a revised teacher evaluation system based on clinical supervision has been mutually developed and adopted by both the teachers association and the board of education supports the belief that Avondale's experiences could benefit other districts interested in implementing clinical supervision.

THE DEVELOPMENTAL PROCESS

The need to restructure the teacher evaluation system came about as a result of a broad district goal established in 1984 to improve the learning outcomes of students. One of the many interrelated activities initiated that year was to involve all teachers and principals in substantive and ongoing training in instructional methodology. Hunter's I-TIP (Instructional Theory Into Practice) model was selected as the district's framework for incorporating the principles of learning in teaching behaviors.

Over a three year period, all instructional staff participated in the district sponsored I-TIP in-service. The core training was followed with review and refresher sessions. A common instructional language was used to describe specific teaching and learning events. Teachers from one school would visit colleagues in other buildings to participate in group discussions on teaching. Through observation, coaching, modeling, scripting, and continuous dialogue, teachers and principals increased and expanded their knowledge of and skill in the profession of teaching. Quality instruction was considered to be of paramount importance throughout the district.

With this heightened appreciation for instructional expertise and the ensuing attention the entire teaching-learning process was receiving, the teacher evaluation system was critically examined in a new context. As is the situation in many school districts, the required evaluation form in use in Avondale at that time determined the evaluation process and content. The form was a checklist with a rating scale for 15 items which

clearly emphasized a teacher's "keeping" abilities and only hinted (one item) of the need for the teacher to demonstrate effective instructional skills. (See Appendix A.)

Folks were confused. Mixed messages were being received. If the instructional practices of the teacher were considered to be critically important in determining the learning outcomes of students, and if the district was involving all school administrators and teachers in staff development activities designed to enhance their mastery of instructional techniques, why then was the principal assessing the performance of the teacher on everything but observable instructional expertise? It appeared that a major incongruency existed between what was preached and what was practiced.

Obviously, the disparity needed to be corrected. Beginning with the 1985-1986 school year, the existing evaluation purpose, process, and recording forms were thoughtfully examined by a newly formed district steering committee comprised of union leadership, teachers of various grade levels and subject areas, principals, and the director of curriculum. It was the consensus of the group that an improved system of teacher evaluation which directly addressed the instructional process needed to be developed. Thus began the movement for a collegial instructional emphasis in teacher evaluation.

The steering committee realized that their task was a formidable one which would require the full cooperation and involvement of both teachers and administrators. Everyone was aware of the complex array of emotions which surround the evaluation process. At work, too, was the adversarial view of evaluation held by some veteran educators in the district. A worry expressed was that this mentality could preclude the possibility of shared decision making, mutual planning, and supportive relationships. It not only could pit administrators against teachers, it could be equally divisive among teachers hoping to coach and model for their colleagues.

Being sensitive to the needs and feelings of their peers, the planning committee agreed upon an investigation process which would be open, inclusive, thorough, and objective. Committee members were given responsibility for reviewing the literature on teacher evaluation, reporting on the various methods and models, and collectively selecting or designing the system which would best support Avondale's emphasis on instructional excellence.

All teachers and administrators were informed of the purpose and composition of the steering committee. Progress and activity reports were regularly shared with school staffs and committee members provided brief updates at their faculty meetings. Research findings and pertinent journal articles were systematically shared with all instructional employees. Open invitations were extended to all teachers and principals to attend committee meetings and to participate in discussions.

To publicly support and emphasize the importance of the charge of the steering committee, the board of education listed the improvement of the teacher evaluation system as a district objective for the 1985-1986 school year. Because the revision could require contract language changes in the teachers' master agreement, an implementation date of 1988-1989 was established. The contract in existence at that time would expire the preceding year.

During the three year developmental period, the committee composition expanded to include additional members and the personnel manager, a new position in the district, replaced the curriculum director as chair of the group. National leaders in the field of teacher evaluation were contracted to provide training for district employees in the different approaches to assessment. The board of education was apprised on a regular basis of the direction and activity of the steering committee.

After all of the careful deliberation and investigation, the committee developed and recommended a model of teacher appraisal that emphasizes the clinical components of formative evaluation distinct and separate from the annual summative assessment. (See Appendix B.) The new system calls for the supervisor and teacher to share equally in the challenge to expand and enhance the teacher's instructional skills. The recommendation was supported by both the teachers' association and the board of education.

In-service was then planned and conducted to familiarize all teachers and administrators with the new evaluation process. The intent was to provide substantial training for everyone in the new roles they would soon assume. At long last the checklist of "keeping" skills had been replaced with specific procedures and recording forms which require the instructional partnership of the supervisor and the teacher. Today in Avondale the message is clear -- quality instruction is a shared responsibility of utmost importance.

END NOTES

[1]For a more extensive discussion of this history see: Sullivan, Cheryl. Clinical Supervision. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, 1980.

[2]See Goldhammer, Robert; Anderson, Robert; and Robert Krajewski. Clinical Supervision. New York: Rinehart and Winston, 1980.

[3]See Acheson, Keith and Meredith Damien Gall. Techniques in the Clinical Supervision of Teachers. New York: Longman, 1987.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Acheson, Keith, and Meredith Damien Gall. Techniques in the Clinical Supervision of Teachers, 2nd edition. New York: Longman, 1987.

Duke, Daniel, and Richard Stiggins. Teacher Evaluation. Washington, D.C.: National Education Association, 1986.

Goldhammer, Robert, et al. Clinical Supervision, 2nd edition. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1980.

McLaughlin, Milbery, and R. Scott Pfeifer. Teacher Evaluation. New York: Columbia University, 1988.

Stanley, Sarah and W. James Popham, eds. Teacher Evaluation: Six Prescriptions for Success. Alexandria, Va.: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, 1988.

Sullivan, Cheryl. Clinical Supervision. Alexandria, Va.: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, 1980.

Wise, Arthur, et al. Teacher Evaluation : A Study of Effective Practices. Santa Monica, CA: Rand Corp., 1984.

A

AVONDALE SCHOOL DISTRICT

Teacher Evaluation

NAME _____ SCHOOL _____

ASSIGNMENT _____ EVALUATION DATE(s) _____

PROBATIONARY: 1st year___ 2nd year___ 3rd year___ 1st evaluation___ 2nd evaluation___ TENURE___

PRINCIPAL _____ SCHOOL YEAR 19_____ to 19_____

Rating Scale: A - Acceptable N - Needs to Improve U - Unobserved NA - Not Applicable
(NOTE: An "N" rating or outstanding performance will be delineated on Page 2 of this form.)

I. PERSONAL AND PROFESSIONAL QUALITIES:

A. Arrives at school by the scheduled time ☐

B. Meets classes by the scheduled time(s) ☐

C. Maintains up-to-date and accurate school records ☐

D. Is prompt in submitting reports and taking care of the details of teaching ☐

E. Attendance (number of chargeable days absent to date _____) ☐

F. Is neatly groomed and appropriately attired for assignment ☐

G. Health and stamina are apparent in job performance ☐

H. Works harmoniously with school staff ☐

I. Classroom environment and teaching techniques are conducive to learning and are appropriate for subject(s) and/or student(s) being taught ☐

J. Interprets student educational and behavioral objectives and student progress to parents with tact and diplomacy ☐

II. RELATIONSHIP WITH STUDENT:

A. Demonstrates good rapport and working relationship with each student ☐

B. Seeks to develop desirable pupil attitudes ☐

C. Shows respect for the student by keeping the confidences imparted by students, parents, school records and other school personnel ☐

D. Takes appropriate action in matters of student truancy, poor scholarship, or unsatisfactory behavior ☐

E. Directs students in proper use and care of school property and equipment ☐

AVONDALE SCHOOL DISTRICT

EVALUATION NARRATIVE

III. TO THE BUILDING EVALUATORS:

Ratings of NEEDS TO IMPROVE will include suggestions for improvement. Areas of outstanding performance, such as school committee assignments and professional improvement, also will be noted. Any other areas of concern by either the Evaluator or Evaluatee shall be noted below. Attach additional sheets as required.

Discussed by teacher and principal on _____(Date)

_____ Teacher

_____ Principal

Please prepare in triplicate - 1 copy to teacher
1 copy to principal
1 copy to Personnel by March 25th

APPENDIX B

AVONDALE SCHOOL DISTRICT
AUBURN HILLS, MICHIGAN

TEACHER EVALUATION

A MODEL FOR CLINICAL SUPERVISION

ADOPTED
JANUARY 1989

CONTENTS

ITEM	PAGE
Appreciation	2
Chronology of Events	3
Former Teacher Evaluation Form	4
Teacher Evaluation Philosophy	6
Teacher Evaluation Process Guidelines	7
Professional Growth Resources	9
Teacher Evaluation Formative Report	10
Teacher Assistance Plan	13
Teacher Evaluation Summative Report	14

APPRECIATION

Thanks are due to all of the teachers and administrators who contributed their ideas and time to the discussion of the teacher evaluation system in Avondale.

Members of the Teacher Evaluation Steering Committee:

Maurice Anderson	Judith Henderson
Janalee Barrick*	Edward Kalinowski
Norine Blake	Kanelo Kastran
Kenneth Brach	William Lynch
Pamela Brininger	Elizabeth Martin
Nancy Campbell	John Petitto
Doris Chase	Lorene Reid
Monte Clute	Paula Robinson
Joseph Coe	Stanley Skavery
Loretta DeMino	James Smith
Vibeke Eggen	Kathryn Stock
Sue Ellis*	Judith Williams
Ruth Gallagher	Kathryn Wilson
Mary Anne Hall	Ann Celine Wydeven

*No longer with Avondale School District

Members of the Teacher Evaluation Working Committee:

Maurice Anderson	Principal Stiles Elementary School
Pamela Brininger	Assistant Principal Avondale Middle School
Nancy Campbell	English Teacher Reading Consultant
Monte Clute	Personnel Manager
Mary Anne Hall	First Grade Teacher Auburn Elementary School
James Smith	English Teacher Avondale Middle School

CHRONOLOGY OF EVENTS IN THE TEACHER EVALUATION IMPROVEMENT PLAN IN AVONDALE

1. **DISTRICT OBJECTIVE - 1985-1986**

   Goal 2: Staff Development

   2.1 Teacher Evaluation

   An improved system of teacher evaluation and a three year implementation plan will be recommended by the Director of Curriculum by March 1986.

2. Ms. Blake convened a committee of administrators, teachers, and the AEA president to plan for an improved process of Teacher Evaluation.

3. A report was made to the Board of Education on March 17, 1986, which identified a plan to move from the traditional checklist teacher evaluation system towards a clinical model of evaluation.

4. A Teacher Evaluation workshop for all administrators and AEA leadership was facilitated by Dr. Richard Manatt, Iowa State University. The in-service was conducted on August 19, 20, and 21, 1986.

5. A second Teacher Evaluation workshop for all administrators, support staff, and AEA officials was facilitated by Dr. Manatt. The dates were May 13 and 14, 1987.

6. All participants in Dr. Manatt's May 1987 workshop were invited to take part in continued dialogue for the purpose of facilitating the teacher evaluation change process.

7. The Teacher Evaluation committee membership was modified to include new parties. The committee determined procedures for planning, then structured a smaller working subcommittee.

8. The Teacher Evaluation working committee held weekly meetings during January and February of 1988 to discuss the teacher evaluation process, to articulate a philosophy, and to conceptualize the clinical evaluation components of formative and summative involvement. Reporting forms were drafted.

FORMER FORM

A

AVONDALE SCHOOL DISTRICT

Teacher Evaluation

NAME _____ SCHOOL _____

ASSIGNMENT _____ EVALUATION DATE(s) _____

PROBATIONARY: 1st year___ 2nd year___ 3rd year___ 1st evaluation___ 2nd evaluation___ TENURE___

PRINCIPAL _____ SCHOOL YEAR 19_____ to 19_____

Rating Scale: A - Acceptable N - Needs to Improve U - Unobserved NA - Not Applicable
(NOTE: An "N" rating or outstanding performance will be delineated on Page 2 of this form.)

I. PERSONAL AND PROFESSIONAL QUALITIES:

A. Arrives at school by the scheduled time ☐

B. Meets classes by the scheduled time(s) ☐

C. Maintains up-to-date and accurate school records ☐

D. Is prompt in submitting reports and taking care of the details of teaching ☐

E. Attendance (number of chargeable days absent to date _____) ☐

F. Is neatly groomed and appropriately attired for assignment ☐

G. Health and stamina are apparent in job performance ☐

H. Works harmoniously with school staff ☐

I. Classroom environment and teaching techniques are conducive to learning and are appropriate for subject(s) and/or student(s) being taught ☐

J. Interprets student educational and behavioral objectives and student progress to parents with tact and diplomacy ☐

II. RELATIONSHIP WITH STUDENT:

A. Demonstrates good rapport and working relationship with each student ☐

B. Seeks to develop desirable pupil attitudes ☐

C. Shows respect for the student by keeping the confidences imparted by students, parents, school records and other school personnel ☐

D. Takes appropriate action in matters of student truancy, poor scholarship, or unsatisfactory behavior ☐

E. Directs students in proper use and care of school property and equipment ☐

AVONDALE SCHOOL DISTRICT

EVALUATION NARRATIVE

III. TO THE BUILDING EVALUATORS:

Ratings of NEEDS TO IMPROVE will include suggestions for improvement. Areas of outstanding performance, such as school committee assignments and professional improvement, also will be noted. Any other areas of concern by either the Evaluator or Evaluatee shall be noted below. Attach additional sheets as required.

Discussed by teacher and principal on _____(Date)

_____ Teacher

_____ Principal

Please prepare in triplicate - 1 copy to teacher
1 copy to principal
1 copy to Personnel by March 25th

AVONDALE SCHOOL DISTRICT
AUBURN HILLS, MICHIGAN

TEACHER EVALUATION PHILOSOPHY

Teacher evaluation in the Avondale School District is viewed as an integral step in providing quality education. The primary purpose of evaluation is to improve the quality of instruction and learning in the classroom. The evaluation process will, furthermore, be used to promote and develop professional growth among staff. The techniques utilized to improve instruction will be observation, feedback, and follow-up.

Evaluation is an ongoing process done with people and not to them. This evaluation consists of a clearly defined set of administrative procedures wherein the individual being evaluated and those responsible for evaluation cooperate to achieve specified goals. While the end goal of evaluation is to improve instruction for students, an important secondary result should be the continued growth for the teacher.

AVONDALE SCHOOL DISTRICT
AUBURN HILLS, MICHIGAN

TEACHER EVALUATION PROCESS GUIDELINES

CLINICAL SUPERVISION MODEL

Formative Evaluation

The Formative Evaluation component is designed to assist and promote improvement in the teaching abilities of the instructor. It is ongoing and includes coaching and counseling. All assessments, conclusions, and recommendations for improvement are based upon direct observations of the teaching process. Such observations are recorded or scripted by the observer as the teaching takes place.

Process

1. A teacher or administrator may request a Formative Evaluation at any time.

2. A Formative Evaluation may be completed without an accompanying Summative Evaluation.

3. During a year in which a teacher receives a Summative Evaluation, one or more Formative Evaluations will precede it.

4. The teacher has the responsibility to complete the first page of the Formative Evaluation and specify what is to be observed and evaluated.

5. It is the intent of the Formative Evaluation process to give feedback regarding the teaching of a specific lesson observed.

TEACHER EVALUATION PROCESS GUIDELINES

Summative Evaluation

A Summative Evaluation is comprehensive in regard to the teacher's classroom skills, personal qualities, and professional performance.

Process

1. The Summative Evaluation form will be preceded by the use of one or more Formative Evaluations within the same calendar year.

2. The Summative Evaluation form is to be used in compliance with contractual guidelines (Article 5).

Teacher Assistance Plan

The Teacher Assistance Plan is intended to assist teachers in correcting serious deficiencies.

Process

1. The Teacher Assistance Plan is to be completed by the administrator and discussed with the teacher.

2. More than one Teacher Assistance Plan may be utilized to correct an identified deficiency.

3. Possible Resources for teacher growth are to be included with any Teacher Assistance Plan (see attached).

AVONDALE SCHOOL DISTRICT
AUBURN HILLS, MICHIGAN

TEACHER EVALUATION

PROFESSIONAL GROWTH RESOURCES

1. Visit teachers in building
2. View an administrator teaching a lesson
3. Visit teacher in another district or another building
4. In-service meeting by school, by building, by department, by grade level
5. Conferences/workshops
6. Oakland Schools
7. Professional libraries/resource files in each building
8. Instructional Support Specialist assistance
10. Peer coaching
11. Videotapes on ITIP lessons
12. Teaching techniques tapes
13. Experts from other districts on specific topics.
14. Survey teaching staff to find their personal area of expertise
15. Fitness Center/Wellness seminars
16. Medical examination/physical
17. Support teams -- example, call a friend to get them there on time; record keeping
18. Mini-presentation on record keeping, parental phone calls, or any other problem, by "in-house experts"
19. University courses
20. Utilization of self-instruction computer technology

AVONDALE SCHOOL DISTRICT
Auburn Hills, Michigan

TEACHER EVALUATION
FORMATIVE REPORT

_____
Teacher's Name

_____
Date

TEACHER OBSERVATION PROCESS

I. Pre-Observation Worksheet
(Teacher completes items A-D and returns to administrator.)

A. Objective(s) of lesson(s) to be observed:

B. Which of the eight steps of the teaching act should be observed during this lesson?

_____	Develop anticipatory set	:Prepare students for the lesson
_____	State objectives	:What they are going to do and how
_____	Provide input	:Lecture/demonstration.
_____	Model	:Gives examples, illustrates, demonstrates
_____	Check for comprehension	:Oral, written, questioning
_____	Provide guided practice	:Students demonstrate; you interact
_____	Closure	:Students summarize key elements of lesson
_____	Provide independent practice	:Students produce; you check and grade

C. Other instructional tasks or purposes to be observed (optional):

D. Comments to aid administrator in evaluating (optional):

E. Planned observation date:_____

AVONDALE SCHOOL DISTRICT
Auburn Hills, Michigan

TEACHER EVALUATION
FORMATIVE REPORT

_____
Teacher's Name

_____
Date

TEACHER OBSERVATION PROCESS (continued)

II. Comments on Observation

Describe what was observed in relation to items outlined in Part I (from administrator's scripting, notetaking, other).

III. Post-Observation Conference

A. Class/lesson observed:

B. Were stated objectives met? Explain.

C. What are the strengths of this teacher as demonstrated in this lesson? Explain.

D. Based on the observed lesson, are there areas of needed improvement? If so, a Teacher Assistance Plan may be developed.

IV. Suggestions for continued growth:

Teacher's Signature _____ Date _____ Administrator's Signature _____ Date _____

The presence of the teacher's signature indicates the report has been reviewed by the evaluatee. A signature does not necessarily imply agreement with the evaluation.

AVONDALE SCHOOL DISTRICT
Auburn Hills, Michigan

_____
Teacher's Name

TEACHER ASSISTANCE PLAN

A. Statement of the problem.

B. Goal to be accomplished.

C. Assistance to be provided.

D. Progress Check.

E. Completion deadline.

_____ _____
Administrator's Signature Date

_____ _____
Teacher's Signature Date

The teacher's signature only indicates receipt of this plan.

AVONDALE SCHOOL DISTRICT
Auburn Hills, Michigan

TEACHER EVALUATION
SUMMATIVE REPORT

NAME _____ SCHOOL _____

ASSIGNMENT _____ EVALUATION DATE(s) _____

PROBATIONARY: 1st year ___ 2nd year ___ 3rd year ___ 1st evaluation ___ 2nd evaluation ___ TENURE _____

PRINCIPAL _____ SCHOOL YEAR 19__ to 19____

RATING SCALE: A-Acceptable N-Needs to Improve U-Unobserved NA-Not Applicable

---

I. CLASSROOM SKILLS:

A. Instructional Skills
1. Demonstrates knowledge of subject matter..... ☐
2. Utilizes a variety of materials/methods..... ☐
3. Demonstrates appropriate planning, preparation and lesson design..... ☐

B. Relationship With Students
1. Demonstrates good rapport and working relationship with each student..... ☐
2. Seeks to develop desirable pupil attitudes..... ☐
3. Shows respect for the student by keeping the confidences imparted by students, parents, school records and other school personnel..... ☐
4. Takes appropriate action in matters of student attendance, poor scholarship, or unsatisfactory behavior..... ☐

C. Classroom Management
1. Directs students in proper use and care of school property and equipment..... ☐
2. Demonstrates basic student control and/or discipline..... ☐
3. Organizes and effectively directs students in learning activities..... ☐

II. COMMENTS ON SECTION I.: (A Teacher Assistance Plan may be developed.)

III. PERSONAL AND PROFESSIONAL QUALITIES:

A. Arrives at school by the scheduled time..... ☐

B. Meets classes by the scheduled time(s)..... ☐

C. Maintains up-to-date and accurate school records..... ☐

D. Is prompt in submitting reports and taking care of the details of teaching..... ☐

E. Attendance (number of chargeable days absent to date)..... ☐

F. Health and stamina are apparent in job performance..... ☐

G. Works cooperatively with school staff..... ☐

H. Interprets student progress to parents in an appropriate manner..... ☐

IV. COMMENTS ON SECTION III: (A Teacher Assistance Plan may be developed.)

V. STRENGTHS AND SPECIAL COMMENDATIONS:

VI. SUGGESTIONS FOR CONTINUED GROWTH:

Administrator's signature _____ Date _____

Teacher's signature _____ Date _____

The presence of the teacher's signature shall indicate the report has been reviewed by the evaluatee. The signature does not necessarily imply agreement with the evaluation.